UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/924,524	08/09/2001	Kiyotaka Matsumoto	500.40472X00	4083

24956 7590 07/18/2006	EXAMINER	
MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C. 1800 DIAGONAL ROAD SUITE 370 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314	NGUYEN, TRI V	
	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	1751	

DATE MAILED: 07/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/924,524	MATSUMOTO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tri V. Nguyen	1751	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _21 April 2006_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-7 and 13-24_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-7 and 13-24_ is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) _21-24_ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In the amendment file on April 26, 2006, Claims 1, 2 and 5-7 have been amended, Claims 8-12 have been cancelled and Claims 13-24 have been added. The currently pending claims considered below are Claims 1-7 and 13-24.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 21-24 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 21-24 are dependent claims of claim 19 which is a claim directed to a "system"; however, Claims 21-24 is directed to a "method" claim. For examination purposes, the Examiner has interpreted Claims 21-24 as being dependent on the "system" claim 19. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1, 2, 7,13 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the program suite of "Adfax" and "Adcapture" of FutureTense, Inc. and applied to the "The Boston Globe" website (www.boston.com/globe, hereon referred to as boston.com). Furthermore, the program suite has been described by the published articles of Editor & Publisher (hereon referred to as Editor & Publisher), The Seybold Report Vol. 26, No. 22 (hereon referred to as Seybold 26-22), The Seybold Report Vol. 23, No. 22 (hereon referred to as Seybold 23-22),

Business Wire (hereon referred to as Business Wire) and Peter Dyson and Rosanne Rossello

(hereon referred to as Dyson).

Regarding Claim 1, Boston.com, Seybold 26-22, Seybold 23-22, Business Wire

and Dyson disclose an advertisement contents providing method of displaying, on an

information processing apparatus connected to a network, advertisement contents

registration of which has been requested from a facsimile apparatus, comprising:

- a. receiving facsimile registration information from said facsimile apparatus of
     an advertiser, said facsimile registration information indicating a registrant ID,
     a category ID, and said advertisement contents, and storing image data of
     said advertisement contents into advertiser-dedicated page data
     corresponding to said registrant ID and said category ID described in said
     facsimile registration information wherein the advertiser-dedicated page data
     is in an advertisement service/management processing apparatus
     (Boston.com: page 8, § 1 and pages 12-17; Business Wire: page 1, § 1;
     Dyson: page 2, § 1-6; Seybold 23-22: page 13, lines § 10-11; page 14, § 1-3
     and Seybold 26-22: page 3, § 1-2);

- b. reading, from an advertiser information database a facsimile number of the
     advertiser corresponding to the registrant ID (Dyson: page 2, § 3 and Seybold
     23-22, page 14, parag. 3);

- c. acknowledging receipt of the advertisement contents by accessing the
     facsimile apparatus using the facsimile number read from the advertiser
     information database (Dyson: page 2, § 3);

- d. sending a request for said advertisement contents from a subscriber-side
     processing apparatus to said advertisement service/management processing
     apparatus, said advertisement contents being stored in said advertiser-
     dedicated page data in said advertisement service/management processing
     apparatus (Boston.com: pages 4 [see "Classifieds" section], 12-17 and page
     19),

- e. reading said advertisement contents from said advertiser-dedicated page
     data in said advertisement service/management processing apparatus, said
     advertisement contents being requested by said subscriber-side processing
     apparatus, and sending said advertisement contents to said subscriber-side

processing apparatus (Boston.com: page 4 [see the advertisement banner] and page 19 [the "Classified" section]), and

f. receiving said advertisement contents sent from said advertisement service/management processing apparatus and outputting said advertisement contents to an output device of said subscriber-side processing apparatus (Boston.com: page 4 [see the advertisement banner] and page 19 [the "Classified" section]).

Regarding Claim 2, Boston.com and Editor & Publisher disclose the advertisement contents providing method as claimed in claim 1, wherein the step of acknowledging receipt includes sending back said facsimile registration information to said facsimile apparatus of said advertiser identified by said registrant ID in said facsimile registration information when said facsimile registration information is received (Boston.com: page 8, § 2 and Editor & Publisher: page 1, § 6).

Claim 7 describes a system of the method of Claim 1; therefore, the prior arts of Boston.com, Seybold 26-22, Seybold 23-22, Business Wire and Dyson as set forth above are relied upon to reject Claim 7.

Regarding claim 13, the program suite of "Adfax" and "Adcapture" of FutureTense, Inc. applied to the "The Boston Globe" website, Editor & Publisher, Seybold 26-22, Seybold 23-22, Business Wire and Dyson disclose an advertisement contents providing method of displaying, on an information processing apparatus connected to a network, advertisement contents registration of which has been requested from a facsimile apparatus, comprising:

a. receiving facsimile registration information from the facsimile apparatus of an advertiser, the facsimile registration information indicating a registrant ID, a category ID, and the advertisement contents (Boston.com: page 8, § 1 and pages 12-17; Business Wire: page 1, § 1; Dyson: page 2, § 1-6; Seybold 23-22: page 13, lines § 10-11; page 14, § 1-3 and Seybold 26-22: page 3, § 1-2);

b. storing image data of the advertisement contents into advertiser-dedicated page data corresponding to the registrant ID and the category ID described in the facsimile registration information, wherein the advertiser-dedicated page data is in an advertisement service/management processing apparatus (Boston.com: page 8, § 1 and pages 12-17; Business Wire: page 1, § 1; Dyson: page 2, § 1-6; Seybold 23-22: page 13, lines § 10-11; page 14, § 1-3 and Seybold 26-22: page 3, § 1-2);

c. reading, from an advertiser information database, a facsimile number of the advertiser corresponding to the registrant ID (Boston.com: page 8, § 1 and pages 12-17; Business Wire: page 1, § 1; Dyson: page 2, § 1-6; Seybold 23-22: page 13, lines § 10-11; page 14, § 1-3 and Seybold 26-22: page 3, § 1-2);

d. using the facsimile number read from the advertiser information database to access the facsimile apparatus (Boston.com: page 8, § 1 and pages 12-17; Business Wire: page 1, § 1; Dyson: page 2, § 1-6; Seybold 23-22: page 13, lines § 10-11; page 14, § 1-3 and Seybold 26-22: page 3, § 1-2);

e. sending back registration information to the facsimile apparatus of the advertiser (Boston.com: page 8, § 1 and pages 12-17; Business Wire: page 1, § 1; Dyson: page 2, § 1-6; Seybold 23-22: page 13, lines § 10-11; page 14, § 1-3 and Seybold 26-22: page 3, § 1-2);

f. sending a request for the advertisement contents from a subscriber-side processing apparatus to the advertisement service/management processing apparatus, wherein the advertisement contents are stored in the advertiser dedicated page data in the advertisement service/management processing apparatus (Boston.com: page 8, § 1 and pages 12-17; Business Wire: page 1, § 1; Dyson: page 2, § 1-6; Seybold 23-22: page 13, lines § 10-11; page 14, § 1-3 and Seybold 26-22: page 3, § 1-2);

g. reading the advertisement contents from the advertiser-dedicated page data in the advertisement service/management processing apparatus, the advertisement contents being requested from the subscriber-side processing apparatus (Boston.com: page 8, § 1 and pages 12-17; Business Wire: page 1, § 1; Dyson: page 2, § 1-6; Seybold 23-22: page 13, lines § 10-11; page 14, § 1-3 and Seybold 26-22: page 3, § 1-2);

h. sending the advertisement contents to the subscriber-side processing
    apparatus (Boston.com: page 8, § 1 and pages 12-17; Business Wire: page
    1, § 1; Dyson: page 2, § 1-6; Seybold 23-22: page 13, lines § 10-11; page 14,
    § 1-3 and Seybold 26-22: page 3, § 1-2); and

i. receiving the advertisement contents sent from the advertisement
    service/management processing apparatus and outputting the advertisement
    contents to an output device of the subscriber-side processing apparatus
    (Boston.com: page 8, § 1 and pages 12-17; Business Wire: page 1, § 1;
    Dyson: page 2, § 1-6; Seybold 23-22: page 13, lines § 10-11; page 14, § 1-3
    and Seybold 26-22: page 3, § 1-2).

Claim 19 describes a system of the method of Claim 13; therefore, the prior arts
of Boston.com, Seybold 26-22, Seybold 23-22, Business Wire and Dyson as set forth
above are relied upon to reject Claim 13.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness
rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3, 4, 14 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the

program suite of "Adfax" and "Adcapture" of FutureTense, Inc. applied to the "The Boston

Globe" website, Editor & Publisher, Seybold 26-22, Seybold 23-22, Business Wire and Dyson in

view of Greenberg (WO 00/39657).

Regarding Claim 3, Boston.com discloses the advertisement contents providing

method as claimed in claim 1 (Boston.com: pages 4, 12-17 and 19), but does not

explicitly teach that wherein characters in said image data of said advertisement

contents are recognized so as to generate advertiser-dedicated page data consisting of

character data, and when said subscriber-side processing apparatus that has sent said sending request for said advertisement contents is a portable-type information processing apparatus, said generated advertiser-dedicated page data consisting of said character data is sent to said subscriber-side processing apparatus which is said request source. In an analogous art, Greenberg discloses a method wherein the advertisement is composed, stored in a database, sent to a portable device (cell phone) of a subscriber and displayed on the portable device (page 3, lines 3-18; page 6, lines 3-21 and page 7, lines 3-14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method as taught by Boston.com with sending the advertisement to a portable device as taught by Greenberg since it was known in the art that distributing the advertisement to portable device will enhance the effectiveness of the advertisement as the user has more flexibility in accessing the advertisement.

Regarding Claim 4, Boston.com discloses the advertisement contents providing method as claimed in claim 2 (Boston.com: pages 4, 12-17 and 19), but does not explicitly teach that wherein characters in said image data of said advertisement contents are recognized so as to generate advertiser-dedicated page data consisting of character data, and when said subscriber-side processing apparatus that has sent said sending request for said advertisement contents is a portable-type information processing apparatus, said generated advertiser-dedicated page data consisting of said character data is sent to said subscriber-side processing apparatus which is said request source. In an analogous art, Greenberg discloses a method wherein the advertisement is composed, stored in a database, sent to a portable device (cell phone) of a subscriber and displayed on the portable device (page 3, lines 3-18; page 6, lines 3-21 and page 7, lines 3-14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method as taught by Boston.com with sending the advertisement to a portable device as taught by Greenberg since it was known in the art that distributing the advertisement to portable device will enhance the effectiveness of the advertisement as the user has more flexibility in accessing the advertisement.

Regarding Claim 14, Boston.com discloses the advertisement contents providing method as claimed in claim 13 (Boston.com: pages 4, 12-17 and 19), but does not explicitly teach that wherein characters in the image data of the advertisement contents are recognized so as to generate advertiser-dedicated page data consisting of character data, and when the subscriber-side processing apparatus that has sent the sending request for the advertisement contents is a portable-type information processing apparatus, the generated advertiser-dedicated page data consisting of the character data is sent to the subscriber-side processing apparatus which is the request source. In an analogous art, Greenberg discloses a method wherein the advertisement is composed, stored in a database, sent to a portable device (cell phone) of a subscriber and displayed on the portable device (page 3, lines 3-18; page 6, lines 3-21 and page 7, lines 3-14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method as taught by Boston.com with sending the advertisement to a portable device as taught by Greenberg since it was known in the art that distributing the advertisement to portable device will enhance the effectiveness of the advertisement as the user has more flexibility in accessing the advertisement.

Claim 20 describes a system of the method of Claim 14; therefore, the prior arts of Boston.com, Seybold 26-22, Seybold 23-22, Business Wire and Dyson as set forth above are relied upon to reject Claim 20.

7. Claims 5, 6, 15, 16, 18, 21, 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the program suite of "Adfax" and "Adcapture" of FutureTense, Inc. applied to the "The Boston Globe" website, Editor & Publisher, Seybold 26-22, Seybold 23-22, Business Wire and Dyson.

Regarding Claims 5 and 15, the program suite of "Adfax" and "Adcapture" of FutureTense, Inc. and applied to the "The Boston Globe" website Boston.com disclose the advertisement contents providing method as claimed in claims 1 and 13, but do not explicitly teach further comprising:

   a)   sending an inquiry about collection target information from a sales-office-side processing apparatus to said advertisement service/management processing apparatus, said collection target information indicating an advertiser as a collection target of an advertisement usage fee,

   b)   receiving said inquiry from said sales-office-side processing apparatus, and making reference to advertiser information indicating information on advertisers that have made said contract to perform advertisement publication on said advertiser-dedicated page in said advertisement service/management processing apparatus, and reading, of said advertisers indicated by said advertiser information, information on an advertiser that is in charge of a sales-office that has made said inquiry, and sending, to said sales-office-side processing apparatus, said read information on said advertiser as said collection target information indicating said advertiser to which said sales-office will perform said collection of said advertisement usage fee,

   c)   receiving said collection target information from said advertisement service/management processing apparatus, and outputting said collection target information to an output device of said sales-office-side processing apparatus,

   d)   sending collected information from said sales-office-side processing apparatus to said advertisement service/management processing apparatus, said collected information indicating said advertiser to which said collection of said advertisement usage fee has been performed, and

   e)   receiving said collected information from said sales-office-side processing apparatus, and outputting said collected information to an output device of said advertisement service/management processing apparatus.

   The Examiner notes that the steps of Claims 5 and 15 pertain to standard accounting practices to collect a fee from an advertiser for a displaying an advertisement. Boston.com and Editor & Publisher discloses collecting a fee depending on the attributes (length, type, category and frequency) of the advertisement (Boston.com: pages 12-17 and 20-22) by a sales personnel and program (Boston.com: page 23 and Editor & Publisher: page 1, § 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method as taught Boston.com and Editor & Publisher to establish a sales office in communication with a service/management to collect a usage fee for placing an

advertisement. One would have been motivated to modify the method to better track the advertisement transactions.

Regarding Claim 6, Boston.com and Editor & Publisher disclose the advertisement contents providing method as claimed in claim 2, but do not explicitly teach further comprising:

a)   sending an inquiry about collection target information from a sales-office-side processing apparatus to said advertisement service/management processing apparatus, said collection target information indicating an advertiser as a collection target of an advertisement usage fee,

b)   receiving said inquiry from said sales-office-side processing apparatus, and making reference to advertiser information indicating information on advertisers that have made said contract to perform said advertisement publication on said advertiser-dedicated page in said advertisement service/management processing apparatus, and reading, of said advertisers indicated by said advertiser information, information on an advertiser that is in charge of a sales-office that has made said inquiry, and sending, to said sales-office-side processing apparatus, said read information on said advertiser as said collection target information indicating said advertiser to which said sales-office will perform said collection of said advertisement usage fee,

c)   receiving said collection target information from said advertisement service/management processing apparatus, and outputting said collection target information to an output device of said sales-office-side processing apparatus,

d)   sending collected information from said sales-office-side processing apparatus to said advertisement service/management processing apparatus, said collected information indicating said advertiser to which said collection of said advertisement usage fee has been performed, and

e)   receiving said collected information from said sales-office-side processing apparatus, and outputting said collected information to an output device of said advertisement service/management processing apparatus.

The Examiner notes that the steps of Claim 6 pertain to standard accounting practices to collect a fee from an advertiser for a displaying an advertisement. Boston.com and Editor & Publisher discloses collecting a fee depending on the attributes (length, type, category and frequency) of the advertisement (Boston.com: pages 12-17

and 20-22) by a sales personnel and program (Boston.com: page 23 and Editor &

Publisher: page 1, § 6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary

skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method as taught

Boston.com and Editor & Publisher to establish a sales office in communication with a

service/management to collect a usage fee for placing an advertisement. One would

have been motivated to modify the method to better track the advertisement

transactions.

Regarding claim 16, the program suite of "Adfax" and "Adcapture" of

FutureTense, Inc. applied to the "The Boston Globe" website, Editor & Publisher,

Seybold 26-22, Seybold 23-22, Business Wire and Dyson disclose the advertisement

contents providing method as claimed in claim 13, further comprising:

    a. determining whether the registrant ID matches a registrant ID in the

        advertiser information database (Boston.com: page 8, § 1 and pages 12-17;

        Business Wire: page 1, § 1; Dyson: page 2, § 1-6; Seybold 23-22: page 13,

        lines § 10-11; page 14, § 1-3 and Seybold 26-22: page 3, § 1-2), but do not

        explicitly disclose

    b. wherein if the registrant ID does not match the registrant ID of the advertiser

        information database, the step of sending back the facsimile registration

        information to the facsimile apparatus of the advertiser is performed.

Seybold 23-22 discloses the feature of time stamp check for fax documents in a

database (page 15, parag. 1-3). Furthermore, Dyson discloses the feature of an

identifier in the process of sending a fax confirmation (page 2, parag 2-6). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the method to include sending back a fax if the registrant ID does

not match the registrant ID of the advertiser information database. One would have

been motivated to modify the method to better track the advertisement transactions and

to ensure that the transaction is entered in the accounting division.

Regarding claim 18, the program suite discloses the advertisement contents

providing method as claimed in claim 13, further comprising:

   a. extracting the image data of the advertisement contents and generating a
      Hyper Text Markup Language (HTML) file for displaying the image data
      (Editor & Publisher: page 1, parag. 6 and Boston.com ; and

   b. extracting character data from the image data and generating an HTML file
      for displaying the character data.

Editor & Publisher discloses the feature of scanning the images and converting
the faxes to computer text (page 1, parag. 6). Furthermore, Boston.com discloses the
feature of displaying the advertisement on the web (Boston.com: page 8, § 1 and pages
12-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at
the time the invention was made to modify the method to include the step of converting
to HTML. One would have been motivated to modify the method to facilitate and
expedite the publications onto the Internet.

Claims 21, 22 and 24 describe a system of the method of Claims 15, 16 and 18
respectively; therefore, the prior arts of Boston.com, Seybold 26-22, Seybold 23-22,
Business Wire and Dyson as set forth above are relied upon to reject Claims 21, 22 and
24.

8. Claims 17 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the
program suite of "Adfax" and "Adcapture" of FutureTense, Inc. applied to the "The Boston
Globe" website, Editor & Publisher, Seybold 26-22, Seybold 23-22, Business Wire and Dyson in
view of Hymel (US 6,246,336).

Regarding claim 17, the program suite of "Adfax" and "Adcapture" of
FutureTense, Inc. applied to the "The Boston Globe" website, Editor & Publisher,
Seybold 26-22, Seybold 23-22, Business Wire, Dyson and Hymel disclose the
advertisement contents providing method as claimed in claim 16, but do not explicitly
disclose wherein if the registrant ID does not match the registrant ID of the advertiser
information database, the step of sending back the facsimile registration information to
the facsimile apparatus of the advertiser is not performed and the facsimile registration
information is discarded.

Seybold 23-22 discloses the feature of time stamp check for fax documents in a database (page 15, parag. 1-3). Furthermore, Dyson discloses the feature of an identifier in the process of sending a fax confirmation (page 2, parag 2-6). In an analogous art, Hymel disclose the feature of disregarding an advertisement when errors are found (col 4, lines 18-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method to include disregarding the advertisement submission if the registrant ID does not match the registrant ID of the advertiser information database. One would have been motivated to modify the method to ensure that the transaction is entered in the accounting division since the advertiser cannot be properly identified.

Claim 23 describes a system of the method of Claim 17; therefore, the prior arts of Boston.com, Seybold 26-22, Seybold 23-22, Business Wire, Dyson and Hymel as set forth above are relied upon to reject Claim 23.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed on April 21, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

        a. In response to Applicant's argument that the examiner's ground of rejection under 102(b) is defective (page 21), the Examiner respectfully indicates that the ground of rejection is a program suite of "Adfax" and "Adcapture" of FutureTense, Inc. and applied to the "The Boston Globe" website and that the "The Boston Globe" website, Editor & Publisher, Seybold 26-22, Seybold 23-22, Business Wire and Dyson are used to describe features of the program suite. Therefore, the ground of rejection under 102(b) is proper.

        b. In response to Applicant's argument regarding Claims 1 and 7 that the program suite of "Adfax" and "AdCapture" does not teach or suggest ""receiving facsimile registration information from said facsimile apparatus of

an advertiser, said facsimile registration information indicating a registrant ID,

a category ID, and said advertisement contents, and storing image data of

said advertisement contents into advertiser-dedicated page data

corresponding to said registrant ID and said category ID described in said

facsimile registration information, wherein the advertiser dedicated page data

is in an advertisement service/management processing apparatus" or

"reading from an advertiser information database, a facsimile number of the

advertiser corresponding to the registrant ID" or "acknowledging receipt of the

advertisement contents by accessing the facsimile apparatus using the

facsimile number read from the advertiser information database" (page 28)

and regarding claim 2 "wherein the step of acknowledging receipt includes

sending back said facsimile registration information to said facsimile

apparatus of said advertiser identified by said registrant ID in said facsimile

registration information when said facsimile registration information is

received" (page 29), the Examiner respectfully notes that Dyson discloses the

features of an identifier related to the advertisement and a confirmation fax

being sent to the advertiser via the phone number on the advertiser's fax

(page 2, parag. 1-6); Seybold 23-22 and 26-22 disclose the features of a

classification and an advertisement/advertiser database from which ads can

be extracted and messages can be sent to advertisers (Seybold 23-22: page

14, parag. 1-3 and Seybold 26-22: page 3, parag. 2); and boston.com

discloses the features of a categorization and fax confirmation (Boston.com:

page 8, § 1 and pages 12-17).

      c.   In response to Applicant's argument regarding Claims 3-6 on the basis of

          Claims 3-6 being dependent on Claim 1, the Examiner directs the Applicant

          to the rejection of Claim 1 and the response to the arguments above.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office

action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is

reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Tri V. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-6965. The examiner

can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Douglas McGinty can be reached on (571) 272-1029. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private

PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you

would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the

automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

nvt

ERIC W. STAMBER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600